



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,927	11/06/2000	David D. Kloba	1933.0010009	8134
82515 7590 09/16/2009 Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C. 1100 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
FABER, DAVID				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/16/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/705,927

**Applicant(s)**

KLOBA ET AL.

**Examiner**

DAVID FABER

**Art Unit**

2178

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9-13, 16, 18-22, 25, 27-30 and 34-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 38-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9-13, 16, 18-22, 25 and 27-30, 34-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/17/09
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is made in response to the amendment and the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 17 June 2009.

**This action is made Final.**

2. Claims 1, 9, 10, 18-20, 22, 25, and 27-30 have been amended.
3. Claims 34-40 have been added.
4. The rejection of 1-3, 7, 10-12, 16, 19-21, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whittle et al in further view of Lindsay et al in further view of Burkett et al has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of 4, 13, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whittle et al in further view of Lindsay et al in further view of Burkett et al in further in view of Barron has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
5. Claims 1-4, 7, 9-13, 16, 18-22, 25, and 27-30, 34-40 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 28-30 are independent claims.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

6. Claims 1, 10, 18, 27-30 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species:

**Species I: claims 2-4, 7, 9, 11-13, 16, 20-22, 25, 34-37**, restructuring a document based on device information (class 715)

**Species II: claims 38-40**, use of synchronization with tokens between plurality of computers (class 709)

7. The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.
8. There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
9. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 38-40 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

10. The information disclosure statement filed 17 June 2009 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because due to the excess amount of pages within the book, it places an extreme burden on the Examiner to evaluate its relevance to the claim invention since there was no concise explanations (i.e. pointing out the relevant pages and lines from the book) from the lengthy and complex document

(book) disclosing its relevance; therefore, the Examiner is unable to understand why the information is being submitted and how it is to be understood to be relevant. Thus, the information disclosure statement is not considered. In addition, the reference listed fails to list its pertinent pages. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

### ***Claim Objections***

11. Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities:
12. Claim 30 recites "eight" within the claim limitation. The Examiner believes this a typographical error and should be viewed as "eighth" as done so throughout this Office Action.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

15. Claims 9, 18, 27, 28, 29, and 30 recite the limitation "...an object pointer" in line 4, 3, 5, 22, 22, 30 respectively. Examiner is unsure if this object pointer is a new element or depending on the each object pointer in line(s) 10-11, 11-12, 16, 14, 14, 19 of Claim 1, 10, 19, 28, 29, and 30 respectively. Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

16. Claims 9, 18, 27, 28, 29, and 30 recite the limitation "...an attribute pointer" in line 4, 3, 5, 22, 22, 30 respectively. Examiner is unsure if this attribute pointer is a new element or depending on the attribute pointer in line(s) 11, 12, 17, 14, 15, 19 of Claim 1, 10, 19, 28, 29, and 30 respectively. Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

17. Claims 9, 18, and 27 recites the limitation "respective instance methods" in line 8, 7, 12, respectively. Examiner is unsure if this instance methods is a new element or depending on instance methods in line(s) 5, 4-5, 7, of Claim 9, 10, and 19, respectively. Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

18. Claim 34 recites the limitation "an instance method" in line 8. Examiner is unsure if this instance methods is a new element or depending on instance methods in line(s), 4-5 of Claim 34. Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

19. Claim 34 recites the limitation "a respective object pointer" in line 7. Examiner is unsure if this respective object pointer is a new element or depending on each object pointer in line(s) 1 of Claim 34. Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

20. Claim 34 recites the limitation "using the vtable pointer to access an instance method associated with the object" It is unclear to the Examiner how the vtable pointer accesses an instance method when in line 2 of Claim 34 discloses a vtable pointer that points to an entry in a vtable, and lines 3-4 of Claim 34 discloses a function pointer within an entry in the table that points to an instance method. Thus, based on the claim limitations of Claim 34, a vtable pointer does not point to an instance method, thus it cannot access an instance method; only a function pointer that points to an instance method can access the method. Thus, Claim 34 is viewed as vague and indefinite.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 1-3, 7, 10-12, 16, 19-21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further view of Burkett et al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999)

As per independent Claim 1, Whitledge et al discloses a method comprising:

- Determining layout and rendering parameters based on device information (e.g., Column 8, lines 5-15: Discloses obtaining device-conversion preferences that are to be used to convert an original electronic document into converted electronic document that would allow it to be displayed on a smaller display with a lower resolution, which includes a PDA (Column 21, lines 1-2) The device-conversion preferences would inherently describe the specifications of the display screen of the device which in other words, disclose the resolution, screen size and video information. )
- Parsing requesting content into a document having a plurality of objects, each object having a format based on at least said layout and rendering parameters. (Column 8, lines 19-27: Discloses converting content, wherein content includes objects such as text, images, video, audio, based on preferences into a document. One embodiment includes parsing content into a document that includes converting the content based on the conversion preferences. (Column 23, lines 9-40; FIG 8B)
- Generating a document table for said document, wherein said document table includes object pointers corresponding to respective objects of the plurality of objects, wherein each object pointer includes an attribute pointer that points to a respective object in said content stream;. (Column 24, lines 35-40: Discloses in a embodiment where selected, wherein selected can be all, hypertext elements references (points to the elements) are saved into a symbol table so they can used in other expression or documents. These



references are viewed as pointers to the elements (objects), wherein an reference is a form of attribute pointer since it points to a respective object.)

- transmitting said content stream to a hardware device. (Column 8, lines 29-34, 40-47)

Whitledge et al discloses converting a original electronic document that contains content into a converted electronic document based on conversion preferences. However, Whitledge et al fails to specifically disclose the original electronic document contains a plurality of pages. On the other hand, it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that a document may contain more than one page within it. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Whitledge et al's document to contain more than one pages since it would have provided the benefit of keeping single page document related to each other in one location and reducing the number of total documents which would prevent documents relating to each other being lost or misplaced.

In addition, Whitledge et al, and Lindsay et al fails to specifically disclose inputting said document content into a content stream wherein said content stream includes the plurality of objects, and inputting said document table into said content stream. However, Burkett et al discloses parsing a document into DOM trees and having the tree be streamed into a binary format in which the streamed objects are known as serialized objects. In addition, any embedded or referenced objects are processed recursively during the process. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Thus, pointers remain intact and are presented in the stream. Furthermore,

Burkett et al states the streaming process includes identifying portions or fragments of a document wherein the fragments are written (inputted) into a serialized binary format, thus containing all the fragments or objects are in the content stream. (Abstract, lines 5-10) Therefore, a plurality of objects are presented in the content stream when the fragments are parsed and streamed as serialized binary data. Furthermore, when the document is serialized where its parsed into a DOM tree then serialized, it begins with the root node of the tree, and recursively descends through the lower-level tree nodes. Thus, the tree is serialized (inputted) into a stream in a defined order by levels as it starts with top node, and serialize each node as it descends into lower levels. When finished, the stream is written onto a communications channel. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Whittedge et al discloses an embodiment in by parsing a document first into a DOM tree, and creating a table comprising object references before converting the document. (FIG 9-12, Column 24, lines 9- Column 25, lines 67) Thus in conjunction with Whittedge, a document table containing object references (pointers to elements) are processed, thus remaining intact during Burkett's serialization into a serial data (content stream) Thus, the pointers are presented in the stream.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's invention to have combined Whittedge et al with Lindsay et al's methods since Burkett et al's method would have provided the benefit of wherein documents encoded can be more efficiently processed.

As per dependent Claim 2, Claims 2 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Whittedge et al discloses a method

wherein said object-by-object basis corresponds to distinguishable pieces of request content. (Column 21, line 11 - Column 23, lines 40; FIG 8B: Discloses different objects, text and images, are identified as text and images making them distinguishable.)

As per dependent Claim 3, Whittedge et al discloses a method wherein said document table provides points of reference to the objects of said document content (Column 24, lines 35-40: Discloses in a embodiment where selected, wherein selected can be all, hypertext elements references (points to the elements) are saved into a symbol table so they can used in other expression or documents.

As per dependent Claim 7, Whittedge et al discloses said storing said content stream to a mobile device. (Column 8, lines 29-34; 40-47: Discloses receiving a converted document wherein when the document is received, its inherently saved to temporary memory buffer for further operation.)

As per independent claim 10, Claim 10 recites a system for performing the method of Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 11, Claim 11 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 12, Claim 12 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 16, Claim 16 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per independent claim 19, Claim 19 recites a computer program product... for performing the method of Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 20, Claim 20 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 21, Claim 21 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 25, Claim 25 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

23. Claims 4, 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further view of Burkett et al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further in view of Barron (US Patent #6,665,709, filed 3/27/2000).

As per dependent Claim 4, Whitledge et al discloses compressing said document content (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses image size being reduced or compressed of its original size to be able to meet the conversion preferences.)

However, Whitledge et al, Lindsay et al, and Burkett fail to specifically disclose encrypting said document content. However, Barron discloses a method of encrypting electronic data into an encrypted data packet. (Column 6, Claim 1, line 48-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al, Lindsay et al, and Burkett's

methods with Barron's method since Barron's method would have facilitated virtually impregnable security for the delivery, storage and sharing of documents and files.

As per dependent claim 13, Claim 13 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 22, Claim 22 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

24. Claims 9, 18, 27, 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whittedge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further view of Burkett et al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further view of Lindsay et al (US Patent 6,754,670, filed 12/17/1999) in further view of Gerald et al (US Patent 6,092,079; patented 7/18/2000; filed on 4/7/1998)

As per dependent claim 9, Claim 9 recites similar limitation as in Claim 1 and is similarly rejected under rationale. In addition, Whittedge discloses modifying an object of said content stream (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses content, such as image, being altered or modify to accustom to the PDA device conversion preferences during the process being received by the PDA.) Furthermore, Whittedge and Burlett fails to specifically wherein said object pointer further comprises a vtable pointer for accessing instance methods associated with said object. However, Lindsay et al discloses a relational table mapping within object oriented system wherein the table is mapped (pointing) to an attribute object and associated get/set methods associated the attribute object. (Col 3, line 67- Col 4, line 10) Thus, Lindsay et al discloses a pointer pointing to

an object (attribute object), a form of an attribute pointer, and another pointer pointing to access a instance method associated with the object (get/set methods), a form of a vtable pointer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's invention to have combined Whitley et al and Burkett's method with Lindsay et al's methods since Lindsay et al's method would have provided the benefit of wherein the object oriented system retains flexibility to accommodate changes and increases efficiency.

Furthermore, Whitley et al, Burkett et al and Lindsay et al fail to specifically disclose copying said object to a new memory space for modification, altering said object with respective instance methods accessed using said vtable pointer and updating an attribute pointer of said object pointer to the memory space of said object that has been altered. However, Gerard et al discloses updating an object by making a copy of the object in memory (thus new memory space for modification) wherein the object is updated (altered) by different called methods through the use of a table pointer, and the data pointer (points to the object data (Col 5, lines 20-21) is updated to point to from data section of the original object to the data section of the copied object. (Col 7, line 45 – Col 8, line 10; Col 8, line 63-66; Col 9, lines 45-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Whitley et al, Lindsay et al, and Burkett's methods with Gerald et al's method since Gerald et al would have provided the benefit

of an efficient and less costly method of updating persistent objects in an object oriented computer system.

As per dependent claim 18, Claim 18 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 27, Claim 27 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependents claims 34-36, Claims 34-36 recite similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

25. Claims 28-30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further in view of Barron (US Patent #6,665,709, filed 3/27/2000) in further view of Burkett et al (US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further view of Lindsay et al (US Patent 6,754,670, filed 12/17/1999) in further view of Gerald et al (US Patent 6,092,079; patented 7/18/2000; filed on 4/7/1998).

As per independent Claim 28, Claim 28 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and 9 are similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Whitledge et al discloses a method comprising:

- Determining layout and rendering parameters based on mobile device information (e.g., Column 8, lines 5-15: Discloses obtaining device-conversion preferences that are to be used to convert an original electronic document into converted electronic document that would allow it to be displayed on a

smaller display with a lower resolution, which includes a PDA (Column 21, lines 1-2) The device-conversion preferences would inherently describe the specifications of the display screen of the device which in other words, disclose the resolution, screen size and video information. )

- Parsing requesting content into a document having a plurality of discrete objects, each discrete object having a format based on at least said layout and rendering parameters. (Column 8, lines 19-27: Discloses converting content, wherein content includes objects such as text, images, video, audio, based on preferences into a document. One embodiment includes parsing content into a document that includes converting the content based on the conversion preferences. (Column 23, lines 9-40; FIG 8B)
- Generating a document table based on said object-by-object basis for said document content. (Column 24, lines 35-40: Discloses in a embodiment where selected, wherein selected can be all, hypertext elements references (points to the elements) are saved into a symbol table so they can used in other expression or documents.
- compressing said document content according to said object-by-object basis (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses image size being reduced or compressed of its original size to be able to meet the conversion preferences.)
- modifying an object of said content stream, wherein said object corresponds to distinguishable pieces of said requested content. (Column 23, lines 9-54: Discloses content, such as image, being altered or modify to accustom to the



PDA device conversion preferences during the process being received by the PDA.)

However, Whittedge et al fails to specifically disclose encrypting said document content according to said object-by-object basis. However, Barron discloses a method of encrypting electronic data into an encrypted data packet. (Column 6, Claim 1, line 48-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Whittedge et al with Barron's method since Barron's method would have facilitated virtually impregnable security for the delivery, storage and sharing of documents and files.

Whittedge et al and Barron fail to specifically disclose inputting said document content into a content stream according to said object-by-object basis wherein said content stream includes the plurality of objects, and inputting said document table into said content stream according to said object-by-object basis, wherein said document and said document table form said content stream according to said mobile device information. However, Burkett et al discloses parsing a document into DOM trees and having the tree be streamed into a binary format in which the streamed objects are known as serialized objects. In addition, any embedded or referenced objects are processed recursively during the process. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Furthermore, Burkett et al states the streaming process includes identifying portions or fragments of a document wherein the fragments are written (inputted) into a serialized binary format, thus containing all the fragments or objects are in the content

stream. (Abstract, lines 5-10) Therefore, a plurality of objects are presented in the content stream when the fragments are parsed and streamed as serialized binary data. Furthermore, when the document is serialized where its parsed into a DOM tree then serialized, it begins with the root node of the tree, and recursively descends through the lower-level tree nodes. Thus, the tree is serialized (inputted) into a stream in a defined order by levels as it starts with top node, and serialize each node as it descends into lower levels. When finished, the stream is written onto a communications channel. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Whitledge et al discloses an embodiment in by parsing a document first into a DOM tree, and creating a table comprising object references before converting the document. (FIG 9-12, Column 24, lines 9- Column 25, lines 67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al with Barron's methods since Burkett et al's method would have provided the benefit of wherein documents encoded can be more efficiently processed.

As per independent claim 29, Claim 29 recites similar limitations as in Claim 28 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per independent claim 30, Claim 30 recites similar limitations as in Claim 28 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

26. Claims 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitledge et al (US Patent #6,925,595, filed 10/5/1998) in further view of Burkett et al

(US Patent #6,671,853, filed 7/15/1999) in further view of Lindsay et al (US Patent 6,754,670, filed 12/17/1999) in further view of Gerald et al (US Patent 6,092,079; patented 7/18/2000; filed on 4/7/1998) in further view of Fallon (US Patent 6,309,424; filed on 11/3/2000; continuation of App 09/210491, filed 12/11/1998)

As per dependent claim 37, Whitledge, Burkett, Lindsay, and Gerald failed to specifically disclose decompressing the object. However, Fallon discloses a well-known method of decompressing data (i.e. object) within a compressed data stream. (FIG 1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's invention to have combined Whitledge et al, Burkett, Lindsay, and Gerald with Fallon's disclosure of decompressing data since it would have provided the benefit of reversing the compressed data for the user to access the data as it was originally created.

### ***Response to Arguments***

28. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1, 10, 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Arguments addressing in regards of the new limitations of Claims 1, 10, 19 brought forth in the amendment by deleting the limitation "accessing an object pointer in said document table within said content stream, wherein said object pointer comprises a vtable pointer for accessing instance methods and an attribute pointer for accessing said object within said content stream" has been viewed the new ground of rejection of 35 USC 103(a) under new references using Whitledge et al in view of Burkett et al.

29. Applicant's arguments filed 17 June 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

30. On pages 14-17, in regards to Claims 28-30, Applicant argues that the cited references each individually failed to teach the limitation "wherein said document table includes object pointers corresponding to respective objects of the plurality of objects, wherein each object pointer includes an attribute pointer that points to a respective object in said content stream:"

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In Column 24, lines 35-40, Whitledge et al discloses an embodiment where selected (selected can be all) hypertext element references (points to the elements; thus pointers) are saved in a symbol table so they can be used in other expression or document. These references are viewed as pointers to the elements (i.e objects) wherein an reference is a form of an attribute pointer since it points a (respective) object. However, Whitledge et al fails to specifically disclose inputting said document content into a content stream wherein said content stream includes the plurality of objects, and inputting said document table into said content stream. However, Burkett et al discloses parsing a document into DOM trees and having the tree be streamed into a

binary format in which the streamed objects are known as serialized objects. In addition, any embedded or referenced objects are processed recursively during the process. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Thus, pointers remain intact during the conversion and are present in the stream when created. Furthermore, Burkett et al states the streaming process includes identifying portions or fragments of a document wherein the fragments are written (inputted) into a serialized binary format, thus containing all the fragments or objects are in the content stream. (Abstract, lines 5-10) Therefore, a plurality of objects are presented in the content stream when the fragments are parsed and streamed as serialized binary data. Furthermore, when the document is serialized where its parsed into a DOM tree then serialized, it begins with the root node of the tree, and recursively descends through the lower-level tree nodes. Thus, the tree is serialized (inputted) into a stream in a defined order by levels as it starts with top node, and serialize each node as it descends into lower levels. When finished, the stream is written onto a communications channel. (Column 3, lines 1-26; line 64 – Column 4, line 2) Whittedge et al discloses an embodiment in by parsing a document first into a DOM tree, and creating a table comprising object references before converting the document. (FIG 9-12, Column 24, lines 9- Column 25, lines 67) Thus in conjunction with Whittedge, a document table containing object references (pointers to elements) are processed, thus remaining intact during Burkett's serialization into a serial data (content stream) Thus, the pointers are presented in the stream.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the Applicant's invention to have combined Whittedge et al with Lindsay et al's methods since Burkett

et al's method would have provided the benefit of wherein documents encoded can be more efficiently processed.

Therefore, Whittedge et al and Burkett et al teaches the limitation.

### ***Conclusion***

**31. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David Faber/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/William L. Bashore/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175